

Council. If on the other hand the Iraqis defy the inspectors and the Security Council fails to take action, fails to respond, the U.S. will be faced with going it alone.

In these dramatically different circumstances my amendment calls for a second vote by the Congress to approve an attack of the use of force, but it ensures the President a fast track for its consideration. There are various differences between these two resolutions. The preamble is different, but this is the key difference, and it is an important difference.

I want to make clear, however, that there is no difference with respect to our assessment of Saddam Hussein. Those of us who support this substitute see him as a menace and a threat. We agree with the President in demanding that the Security Council enforce its resolution and allow him no quarter. But for several reasons we do not want to see the United States act alone, and this is not just our concern. Over the last several weeks we have spent days talking to retired general officers who have experience in this field, to General Hoar and General Zinni, former commanders of Central Command, to General Clark and General Boyd, former Commanders of Europe, and they have agreed on this much. If we act alone, they told us, instead of being the United Nations versus Iraq, any war that happens, instead of being a war legitimated by the U.N. Charter, this will be the United States versus Iraq and in some quarters the U.S. versus the Arab and Muslim world. That is why one general officer told us "I fear if we go it alone we may pay a terrible price."

Point number two, in any conceivable military confrontation with Iraq with or without allies, the United States will win. But having allies, especially allies in the region, could be a big tactical advantage, like Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and it will make it easier to achieve victory and less costly in money and, most importantly, less costly in human life.

Three, the outcome after the conflict is actually going to be the hardest part, and it is far less certain. We do not want to win this war only to lose the peace and swell the ranks of terrorists who hate us. A broad-based coalition will raise our chances of success even more in the post-war period.

I know that some will say this is an imposition on the President's power, a second vote, but in truth it is nothing more than the age-old system of checks and balances built in our Constitution. It is one way that Congress can say what we believe, that any action against Iraq should have the sanction of the Security Council and the support of a broad-based coalition, and if it does not, we should have a further say on it.

Others will say that this resolution relies too heavily on the Security Council, but let me say, Mr. Speaker, the precedent it follows was the prece-

dent set by President Bush in 1991. He turned to the United Nations first. He secured a series of resolutions from the Security Council that culminated in Resolution 678. He did not threaten not to go elsewhere, he went straight to the Security Council. The end was a successful military action and I think a model worth emulating. My substitute does just that. I urge my colleagues to follow the precedent set by President Bush in 1991 and support my substitute amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina. First and foremost, this substitute neither recognizes nor protects American sovereignty. It clearly yields to the United Nations the right and obligation to protect America. It relies on the U.N. first as a trigger mechanism. The President must wait until the U.N. acts or if it does not act or if it does not act properly, and God only knows how long that will take, then the President must return to Congress for further authorization for the use of force. And then once authorization is obtained, the use of force is limited to dealing with weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile threats, but what about other threats to the U.S. national security such as the use of conventional weapons or Iraqi terrorism?

Iraq is a terrorist nation. Evidence exists that Iraqi operatives met with al Qaeda terrorists. This amendment does not allow the President to use force now even if an immediate or imminent terrorist threat is present. When the U.N. fails to act or does not act properly, the President must come back to Congress and seek authorization to use military force, but first he must certify to Congress that the U.N. has failed to pass a resolution or the U.N. has passed an insufficient resolution and the use of military force against Iraq "will not impair international cooperation in the fight against terrorism." In other words, if a Nation, say Iran, North Korea or Syria, maintains that it will no longer cooperate in the war against terrorism, then international cooperation has been impaired. How can the President make such a certification? At that point is he unable to ask Congress for the authorization to use force? Why would we want to have these types of roadblocks impeding our President at a time when he is trying to defend the national security of the United States? This amendment imposes a steeple chase on the President with one hurdle after another.

In conclusion, this substitute amendment would strike the bipartisan agreement that we have worked so hard to bring about and which is reflected in House Joint Resolution 114. Its primary focus is on approval of the U.N. before any military action can be

taken against Iraq. It does not recognize the sovereignty of the United States, and it fails to acknowledge the President's warning in his speech on Monday that the danger from the Iraqi regime is an imminent and urgent threat to the United States. I do not propose that we subordinate our foreign policy to the Security Council whose permanent members include France, China, and Russia, and I urge a no on this amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to myself to read what the text of the resolution would provide: "The President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate means, including the Armed Forces of the United States, to compel Iraq to comply with the disarmament provisions of the U.N.," and it cites those, "and any other resolution to require the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, ballistic missiles and the means of producing such weapons."

That is pretty sufficient language.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of the proposal by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Several weeks ago the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and I drafted a resolution for the use of the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) in negotiations with the White House. That draft contained a number of important principles, focusing on the role of the United Nations, on more narrowly defining the threat posed by Iraq as to its weapons of mass destruction, and on planning for what will be needed after the conflict, if military action should be taken.

These principles do not undermine, rather, they strengthen, American national security. Many of these principles have now been included in the resolution offered by the Speaker and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

On Tuesday night, I expressed my support for that resolution as it represents a significant improvement over the original draft submitted by the White House. But the Spratt substitute perfects a number of the principles contained in the base bill.

It connects American efforts more strongly to those of the United Nations. This resolution urges the President to work with the United Nations to enforce Iraqi compliance with its disarmament obligations. If the United Nations authorizes the use of force to achieve these goals, the Spratt resolution provides immediate congressional